Discussion of Strengthening and Streamlining Accreditation

Introduction

This agenda item provides an update on the work to strengthen and streamline the Commission's Accreditation system. The item reports on the work of the Accreditation Advisor Panel and Task groups. Staff will provide an oral update about Commissioner feedback and direction following the presentation of this information at the April 2015 Commission meeting.

Staff Recommendation

This is for discussion only.

Background

The streamlining and strengthening plan adopted by the Commission called for establishing a series of task groups to assist the Commission in completing this important work in a relatively short period of time. Six Task Groups, as well as an Advisory Panel representing nine key stakeholder organizations and the Co-Chairs of each of the six Task Groups, have been organized. Three of the Task Groups as well as the Advisory Panel met in December 2014 and all groups met in January 2015.

4B

Information/Action

Educator Preparation Committee

Update on the Work to Strengthen and Streamline the Commission's Accreditation System

Executive Summary: This agenda item provides an update on the work to strengthen and streamline the Commission's Accreditation system. The item reports on the March 2015 meeting of the Accreditation Advisory Panel and Task Groups and describes the plans to complete the work.

Policy Question: Does the work to date align with the Commission's expectations?

Recommended Action: That the Commission provide feedback on the work to date and direction for future work.

Presenters: Cheryl Hickey and Phyllis Jacobson, Administrators, and Teri Clark, Director, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal

II. Program Quality and Accountability

a) Develop and maintain rigorous, meaningful, and relevant standards that drive program quality and effectiveness for the preparation of the education workforce and are responsive to the needs of California's diverse student population.

Update on the Work to Strengthen and Streamline the Commission's Accreditation System

Introduction
This agenda item presents an update on the work to date to strengthen and streamline the Commission's Accreditation System. An update was provided at the February 2015 Commission meeting (http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2015-02/2015-02-4D.pdf).

Background
Members of the six Task Groups as well as the Advisory Panel are identified in Appendix A. The six task groups are focusing on specific aspects of the work as follows:

Preliminary Teacher Preparation Standards
The group is charged to recommend revisions to the preliminary multiple and single subject program standards. Co-chairs: Sharon Russell, CalState TEACH, CSU and Victoria Graf, Loyola Marymount University.

Induction Standards, Policies and Regulations
The group is charged to review recent policy changes and recommend revisions to induction standards and regulations governing the General Education (Multiple Subject and Single Subject) Clear Credential. Co-chairs: David Simmons, Ventura COE and Jane Robb, California Teachers Association.

Performance Assessments - Teacher and Administrator
The group is charged to provide guidance regarding teacher and administrator performance assessments, including standards governing the development and implementation of performance assessments. Co-chairs: Tine Sloan, University of California, Santa Barbara and Amy Reising, High Tech High.

Accreditation Policy and Procedures
The group is charged to recommend needed changes in accreditation policy and procedures based on new standards, assessments, and outcomes data. Co-chairs: Margo Pensavalle, University of Southern California and Committee on Accreditation member, and Cheryl Forbes, University of California, San Diego.

Outcomes and Survey Data
The group is charged to review and redesign surveys based on changes in standards, make recommendations regarding useful reporting practices and formats, and standardize the use of this information in accreditation. Chair: Jon Snyder, Stanford University.

Public Access and Data Dashboards
The group is charged to recommend ways to improve public access to information about preparation programs and institutions. Co-chairs: Kathleen Knutzen, CSU Bakersfield and Carlye Olsen, Whittier Union High School District

Update on Activities to Strengthen and Streamline the Accreditation System
The overarching purpose of this work is to revise the present Accreditation System to be a more streamlined, coherent system of educator preparation and program quality oversight purposefully focused on the transparent demonstration of quality outcomes. The result of this work should be a seamless system of high quality educator preparation, accountability and support.

The system that is being proposed will have the following elements that, when taken as a whole, provide a high quality preparation and support system for California's educators, including teachers, administrators, and other credential holders who work with California's K-12 public school students. These elements together constitute a fully-developed continuum of preparation, support, and demonstration of candidate competency at each level of the system, along with a coherent and consistent set of accreditation activities that assess program quality and candidate competency to produce and support the educators needs. It is important to note, however, that the Commission's authority extends to the first two years in the profession, or Induction, and that professional development and support after the initial years in the profession are not within the Commission's purview.

The system's interdependent elements and current development status are outlined below. A check mark indicates that a particular task or task element has been completed and is not being worked on further by the relevant Task Group; a dot indicates that the task has not yet been completed and is still in progress.

Beginning Teacher Preparation
- Updated TPEs
- Updated Teacher Preparation Program Standards
- ✓ Updated TPA Design Standards – adopted by the Commission
- ✓ Updated TPA Program Implementation Standards – on April 2015 Commission agenda
- Updated TPA models, with centralized scoring
- Completer surveys – implemented, but survey revisions in progress
- Additional surveys (e.g., employers, master teachers, others)

Teacher Induction
- Updated Induction Program Standards
- Completer surveys
- Additional surveys (e.g., employers, mentor teachers, others)

Beginning Administrator Preparation
- ✓ Updated Content and Performance Expectations – adopted by the Commission
- ✓ Updated Preliminary Administrative Services Preparation Program Standards – adopted by the Commission
- ✓ APA Design Standards – on April 2015 Commission agenda
- ✓ APA Program Implementation Standards – on April 2015 Commission agenda
- ✓ Updated CPACE examination for examination route candidates – implementation July 2015
- • Administrator Performance Assessment for program route candidates
- • Completer surveys

Clear Administrator Induction
- ✓ Updated CPSEL – adopted by the Commission
- ✓ Updated Clear Induction Administrator Preparation Program Standards – adopted by the Commission
- • Induction implementation support training and modules

Accreditation Processes – All Programs and Credential Levels
- • Updated accreditation processes (e.g., Biennial reports, survey data collection, analysis and use, focus on data reporting and use)
- • Increased focus on outcomes rather than inputs
- • Updated transparency for program outcomes (e.g., data dashboards)
- • Discussion of identification of excellent or exemplary programs or institutions

Completely revising and rebuilding an Accreditation System represents a dauntingly huge body of work. In order to focus resources effectively on accomplishing this body of work in a relatively short amount of time, the work was divided and assigned to the six different Task Groups as indicated above. However, staff is working with each group during the group meeting, and staff will work together as the various products from the Task Groups are completed to assure that the products of the Task Groups relate effectively to each other to become the envisioned streamlined and updated Accreditation System. Although it may seem that certain groups are completing tasks in different time frames or rhythms from other groups, this is a temporary situation while the work is ongoing. The work products that will be discussed further below in this agenda item represent work in progress rather than finished tasks.

Summary Overview of the Task Group Work and Outcomes as of the March 2015 Meeting
This section of the agenda item presents more details about the work in progress by all six task groups along with the direction envisioned for future work.

Accreditation Advisory Panel
The Accreditation Advisory Panel (AAP) consists of the chairs of each Task Group and representatives from key stakeholder organizations. Stakeholder representatives rotate

through observing the work of the six Task Groups, work with co-chairs and staff to synthesize emerging recommendations, and monitor the overall progress of the work.

On the second day of the March 2015 meeting the AAP stakeholder representatives met with the Executive Director and the Director of the Professional Services Division to provide feedback on the work of the Task Groups.

A key responsibility of the stakeholder representatives on the AAP is to share progress with their stakeholder organization and bring the organization's feedback to the work. Each agreed to share the work with his or her organization and to collect feedback from the organization.

It is important to note that although six distinct task groups have been organized, Task Group work necessarily interacts and is interconnected. One way the groups are addressing and moving forward their interrelated work is to identify common or overlapping topic areas and meet together to work on these items. For example, both the Preliminary Teacher Preparation Standards Task Group and the Performance Assessment Task Group have a common interest in revisions to the *Teaching Performance Expectations* and are working together on this topic. A description of the current work of each of the six Task Groups follows.

Preliminary Teacher Preparation Standards

The Preliminary Standards Task Group focused on its mandate to streamline the preparation program standards while at the same time strengthening the clarity and scope of the standards. The decision to use the TPEs as the major focus of the work of preparation programs was key to reducing the overall number of standards to prioritize the critical work of preparing candidates to meet the TPEs. The total number of program standards has been reduced to four. Of the four program standards, one focuses on the theory underlying the program's approach; the second focuses on the program's work to prepare candidates to meet the TPEs; the third focuses on strengthening and clarifying the clinical practice provided to all candidates; and the fourth and final standard focuses on the assessment pieces to document both candidate progress towards meeting the TPEs and the use of appropriate data sources for program improvement purposes.

It is important to note that the draft standards provided below represent a first draft at organizing and codifying the concepts listed above and will be modified following further discussion at the Task Group's May meeting and consideration of feedback from the Commission and the field. However, the initial draft of these standards signals the intended direction of this work in progress to the Commission and to the field.

INITIAL DRAFT Preliminary Program Standards

1) **Program Standard One: Theoretical Foundations**
   The program design and assessment systems are based on a coherent rationale, theoretical and evidence-based foundation related to:
   (a) infant, child and adolescent typical and atypical development (cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical);

(b) human learning;

(c) social, cultural, philosophical, and historical foundations of education;

(d) pedagogical strategies;

(e) curriculum, instruction, and assessment; and

(f) student accomplishments, attitudes, and conduct.

2) **Program Standard Two: Preparing Candidates to Master the TPEs**

The Teaching Performance Expectations describe the professional knowledge and skills that teacher candidates need to know and be able to do to effectively educate and support all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards.

The planned curriculum of coursework and clinical practice embeds multiple opportunities for candidates to learn, apply, and reflect on each Teaching Performance Expectation (TPE). As candidates progress through the program, pedagogical assignments within the program are increasingly complex and challenging. Candidates are coached and assisted by program faculty, supervisors, and district-employed supervisors so they can satisfactorily complete these assignments. The scope of the pedagogical assignments (a) addresses the TPEs as they apply to the subjects to be authorized by the credential, (b) prepares the candidate for the teaching performance assessment (TPA), and other program based assessments.

In clinical practice, qualified supervisors assess candidates' pedagogical performance in relation to the TPEs and provide formative and timely performance feedback regarding candidates' progress toward meeting the TPEs.

3) **Program Standard Three: Clinical Practice**

Clinical Practice Description

Clinical Practice is a developmental and sequential set of activities that are integrated with theoretical and pedagogical coursework consisting of a minimum of 600 hours of clinical practice across the arc of the program. Clinical Practice includes supervised early field experience (interns would have early field experience in an experienced mentor's classroom), initial student teaching (co-planning and co-teaching with both general educators and Education specialists, as appropriate, or guided teaching), and final student teaching. Student teaching includes a minimum of four weeks of solo or co-teaching or its equivalent.

Program orientation and preparation are provided for program supervisors and district employed supervisors. Program Supervisors would be expected to meet with candidates a minimum of 4 times a quarter or 6 times a semester. Cooperating or master teachers would be expected to provide a minimum of 5 hours of support and guidance per week.

Clinical observation may include an in-person site visit, video capture or synchronous video observation, but it must be archived either by annotated video or scripted observations and evaluated with valid measures, based on the TPEs, that produce data

that can be aggregated and disaggregated.

Criteria for school placements
Clinical sites (schools) demonstrate commitment to collaborative evidence-based practices and continuous program improvement, have partnerships with entities in the learning to teach continuum, have students with disabilities in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), English learners and socio-economic and cultural diversity, and permit video capture for candidate reflection and TPA completion. A qualified site administrator is at the school; it is expected that the site administrator hold a valid credential.

Criteria for the selection of program/university supervisor
The individual is credentialed or has equivalent expertise in the supervision content area, has five years of content area teaching experience or its equivalent including evidence of effective practice and holds a Master's Degree or higher or its equivalent. The individual has contemporary professional experiences in school settings at the levels they supervise.

The program provides supervisors a minimum of 10 to 20 hours of initial preparation in the program curriculum, assessment measures such as the TPEs and TPA, coaching, adult learning, and current content and instructional practices.

Criteria for the selection of district-employed supervisors (also known as the district employed supervisor, master teacher or on-site mentor)

The individual holds a Clear Credential in content area for which he or she is providing supervision, five years of content area K-12 teaching experience.

The individual demonstrates exemplary teaching practices as determined by their employer and the preparation program or by holding National Board Certification, participates in professional development, collaborates with other teachers, and values mentoring as a professional growth opportunity. The matching of candidate and district-employed supervisor is a collaborative process between the school district and the program.

The program provides district employed supervisors a minimum of 10 to 20 hours of initial preparation in the program curriculum, assessment measures such as the TPEs and TPA, coaching, adult learning, and current content and instructional practices.

4) **Program Standard 4: Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progress towards Mastering the TPEs and TPA**
Program faculty, program supervisors, and district-employed supervisors monitor and support candidates during their progress towards mastering the TPEs. Appropriate information is accessible to guide candidates' attainment of all program requirements.

The program provides support and assistance to candidates and only retains candidates who are suited for advancement into teaching. Evidence regarding candidate progress and performance is utilized to guide advisement and assistance efforts.

TPA Implementation Standards: The Commission has draft TPA implementation Standards on its April 2015 agenda in item 4A. Those standards would be included here in the Preliminary Program Standard

Clear/Induction Transition Plan: Before exiting the preliminary program, candidates, district-employed supervisors, and program supervisors collaborate on an individual development plan consisting of recommendations for professional development and growth in the candidate's clear program. The plan is a portable document archived by the preliminary program and transferred to the candidate for transmission to the clear/induction program.

Future Task Group Work
The Preliminary Standards Task Group will continue its work on the draft Program Standards as well as the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) at the May meeting.

Induction Standards, Policies and Regulations
The Induction Task Group continued its work in March through a conference call and a web-based meeting in addition to the two-day meeting at the Commission. The Task Group has reached preliminary agreement on the broad outlines of the proposed Induction standards. A draft of these standards is expected to be completed at the May 2015 Task Group meeting and presented for information at the June 2015 Commission meeting.

The Induction Program Standards revision would potentially reduce the number of standards from six to five, while emphasizing the central focus on the support system provided to beginning teachers, especially through the collaborative work undertaken by the teacher with his/her mentor.

The topic areas for the five potential draft standards are outlined below. The information below does not represent draft program standards per se, but rather the outline of the key concept(s) that would be addressed by actual program standards.
A. **California Standards for the Teaching Profession**
Key concept(s): Induction programs support candidate growth and development as defined in the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP).

B. **Opportunity to Apply and Demonstrate the CSTP**
Key concepts: program responsibilities to provide opportunities for candidates to learn, apply, and demonstrate competency relative to the California Standards for the Teaching Profession adopted by the Commission.

Program Design and Rationale

- Focus on mentoring, with individualized opportunities to learn
- Program design features are selected to increase teacher efficacy (improved practice) and teacher satisfaction (increased retention)
- Not less than one hour per week (average) of support provided directly by the mentor or coordinated by the mentor with other members of the support team

Goal Setting

- Candidate and mentor collaborate to identify professional goals
- Employer participates by providing input on district goals and an introduction to the position
- Goals may include additional areas specific to the teaching assignment, e.g., advanced certification, linked learning, early childhood education, positive behavior and intervention

Individualized Learning Plan (ILP)

- Working document to define the scope and emphases of the work, and offers direction for the mentor in providing assistance and support
- Developed at the onset of program, using identified goals and measurable outcomes, and is revisited throughout program
- Includes cycle(s) of inquiry

C. Mentoring

Key concept(s): During Induction, candidates deserve and require a coordinated and comprehensive system of support from mentors who are well-qualified and prepared for their roles.

Mentors facilitate and coordinate a system of support for candidates as well as providing direct support. Mentoring is purposeful and supports the maturation of the candidate's practice. Mentors receive initial training and ongoing support and refinement of their skills by engaging in a community of practice with their mentor-peers. The Induction Program selects, prepares, assigns, supports, and supervises mentors, using well-defined criteria, including:

- Relevant knowledge of the context and culture of the candidate's assignment
- Resourcefulness in meeting beginning teacher needs
- Demonstrated commitment to professional learning and collaboration
- Student-centered approach to professional practice
- Possession of a Clear Credential

D. Program Responsibilities for Mentoring and Related Candidate Support

Key concept(s): The program is responsible for assuring not only that a qualified pool of trained mentors is available to support candidates during Induction, but also that the quality and effectiveness of the interactions between mentors and candidates are evaluated and interventions occur as needed. The program must also ensure that sufficient time is available for mentoring and other activities included in each

candidate's Individual Induction Plan (ILP).

The program is responsible for developing an adequate pool of qualified mentors, and for providing mentor training and ongoing support to mentors through facilitating professional networks. The program monitors and assesses the quality of support provided by mentors and has a system for reassigning mentors if the candidate/mentor pairing is not successful. The program ensures dedicated time for regular mentor and candidate interactions and other activities contained in the ILP.

E. Program Completion
Key concept(s): The program has a coherent, consistent and transparent system for reviewing evidence that a candidate has completed all program and credential requirements prior to recommendation of the candidate for the credential.

The results of candidate assessments included within the ILP are used by the program in deciding whether to recommend the candidate for a Clear Credential. The program sponsor's verification that candidates have met all requirements for the Clear Credential is based on a review of observed and documented evidence, collaboratively assembled by the candidate and a mentor and/or other colleagues, according to program design specifications.

Additional Concepts Discussed by the Induction Task Group
The Induction Task Group believes that the refocusing of Induction on assuring that candidates receive consistent, ongoing and high quality mentoring along with sufficient time for both the candidate and the mentor to accomplish their mutual work is absolutely necessary in order to revise, streamline, and update the statewide Induction system. The Task Group wishes to highlight the critical need for technical assistance to clearly convey to programs their role and need to focus on defining clear outcomes for the mentoring process and for candidate demonstration of growth during Induction. The Task Group also suggests that a program implementation guide be developed to help programs reorient their design and services to these expectations. The implementation guide would include the explicit expectation that documentation required of the candidate and the mentor by the program should be designed to be succinct and not impose a burden on the candidate. Finally, the Task Group believes that programs should also be made aware of the importance of using defined candidate and program outcomes in a streamlined manner to document candidate and program quality, and not to overproduce or rely on lengthy documentations of inputs.

Future Task Group Work
The Task Group will continue to work on the program standards during its May 2015 meeting, including discussing the Clear Education Specialist Induction Standards as well as the definition of candidate demonstration of growth. The plan is to align the special education induction requirements with the changes to general education induction standards as described above.

Performance Assessments

The Performance Assessment Task Group completed the following work during the two-day March 2015 meeting:

- Reviewed draft TPEs shared by the Standards Task Group and provided feedback and suggestions to the Standards group.
- Reviewed and made final edits to the draft TPA program implementation standards being presented to the Commission in a separate agenda item at the April 2015 Commission meeting.
- Reviewed and made final edits to the draft Administrator Performance Assessment (APA) Design Standards and to the draft APA program implementation standards for the program route to the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential. Both sets of standards are also being presented to the Commission in a separate agenda item at the April 2015 Commission meeting.
- Responded to questions from members of other task groups during a designated across-group "emissary" time and also participated as "emissaries" to other task groups during that same time frame.

Future Task Group Work

This task group has completed its formal work and will not meet in May 2015. A subgroup of this Task Group, however, will continue to provide input into the draft TPEs since the TPEs form the basis for all of the teaching performance assessment models approved by the Commission for use with California preliminary multiple and single subject credential candidates.

Accreditation Policy and Procedures

The Accreditation Process Task Group is charged with recommending changes in accreditation policies and procedures based on new standards, assessments and the increased focus on outcomes. The discussion at its second meeting was productive, although the group determined that many issues needed further discussion. The following work was addressed during the March 2015 meeting:

1) *Revising the Common Standards.* The Task Group has discussed a streamlined Common Standards document that would be comprised of 4 standards as follows:

Proposed Revised and Streamlined Common Standards
Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation
Includes concepts from these Common Standards: 1: Educational Leadership, 3: Resources, and 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel
Standard 2: Continuous Improvement
Includes concepts from these Common Standards: 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation, and 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel (section on academic standards, frameworks and accreditation systems)
Standard 3: Candidate Support
Includes concepts from these Common Standards: 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation, 5: Admission, 6: Advice and Assistance, and 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence

Proposed Revised and Streamlined Common Standards
Standard 4: Field Work and Clinical/Professional Practice
Includes concepts from these Common Standards: 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation, 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel (section on performance of course instructors and field supervisors), 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice, and 8: District-Employed Supervisors

Draft language for these standards was reviewed carefully by the group. Currently, the Task Group is providing staff with input on the most recent draft. A discussion will be held at the next meeting or if feasible prior to the next meeting to continue the revision process. It is anticipated that a draft set of revised Common Standards will be presented for information at the June meeting of the Commission.

2) *The Use of Data in the Accreditation Process.* The second meeting of the Accreditation process group focused heavily on the role of data in the accreditation system. These included attention to the following:

   a. *Institutional and Program Expectations for collection, analysis, and program modifications based on candidate assessment data and program effectiveness data.* Currently, institutions and programs are required to collect candidate assessment and program effectiveness data annually and to report this information to the Commission biennially. The Accreditation Process Task Group agreed that annually all institutions and programs should be, at minimum, collecting, analyzing, and considering program modifications as a matter of good practice and that this expectation should be maintained in the revised system. Institutions would be required to post some of the data annually; and post the analysis of the prior two years of data and program effectiveness three times in a seven year cycle, in the fall of Years 2, 4, and 6.

   b. *Reporting and Commission review of candidate assessment and program effectiveness data.* Although all institutions would be required to post some of the data annually and the analysis of the data and program effectiveness in years 2, 4, and 6, the review process will change and may vary throughout the cycle. The review may include the following: 1) a Commission staff review to ensure data is posted and complete, 2) a review of the institutional report (Dean's report) by Commission staff and the COA, and 3) a closer review by BIR team members prior to the accreditation site visit regarding how the data informs program quality. Additional discussion of these review processes are necessary.

   c. *Review of the Current Biennial Report Template.* The Task Group reviewed and discussed the biennial report template that was piloted this year and discussed possible revisions to clarify the template.

   d. *The Role and Use of Survey Data in Accreditation Processes.* The Task Group reviewed the draft program completer survey as context for discussing the role of survey data in the process. Additional discussion is necessary.

e. *The Use of the prospective Data Dashboard*. The Task Group spent significant time hearing from the Data Dashboard group to better understand the vision for the data warehouse that would generate the data dashboard, and to discuss how that vehicle might house some of the accreditation documentation and data.

3) *Identification of Effective or Exemplary Practices or Programs*. The Task Group began the discussion of how the accreditation system could be used to identify institutions or programs that are particularly effective at delivering services to prospective candidates. The discussion included an overview of the CSU-led pilot Academy for Excellence in Education as well as other options. One option discussed by the Task Group was the possible use of rubrics in accreditation decisions, a process similar to the NCATE/CAEP strategy of where institutions identify how they are nearing or meeting a standard at a "target" level. The Accreditation Policies and Procedures Task Group believes that identifying effective or exemplary practices should be a part of the Commission's accreditation system and plans to discuss this topic in more depth at its May meeting.

4) *The Accreditation Cycle and Differentiation of Activities* based on criteria or "triggers." In keeping with the intent to reward institutions with a history of strong programs and to focus greater oversight on programs in need of additional attention, the Task Group touched upon numerous topics. First, the members agreed a common cycle for all institutions should continue. The cycle should remain at 7 years with a minimum of one site visit in those 7 years. The cycle, as discussed by the group, could be as indicated in the following chart:

Accreditation Activities

Annual Data Collection, Review, and Analysis
In addition to specific activities occurring by year, institutions are expected to annually gather, review and analyze data; and post specified outcome data and survey data to inform the Data Dashboard. In addition, some information should be posted to the institution's accreditation webpage such as program data and documentation, program modifications, transitions and/or changes in syllabi including a brief rationale for the change. *Note: current accreditation activities are shown below in parentheses*

Year	Proposed Accreditation Activity and Submissions by Year	
	Accreditation Activity	**When**
Year One	Gather, review and analyze data to Inform program **Post Data** - as defined for data submission	End of Term
Year Two	**Submit** to CTC for Year 7/Year 1 --- Analysis of Data and Resulting program modifications (Biennial Report)	Fall
	Gather, review and analyze data to inform program **Post Data**	End of Term

Year	Proposed Accreditation Activity and Submissions by Year	
	Accreditation Activity	When
Year Three	Gather, review and analyze data to inform program **Post Data**	End of Term
Year Four	**Submit** to CTC for Year 2/Year 3 Analysis of Data and Resulting program modifications (Biennial Report)	Fall
	Gather, review and analyze data to inform program **Post Data**	End of term
Year Five	Gather, review and analyze data to inform program **Post Data**	End of term
	Post Program Documentation for Review - Standards Matrix, short response template and documentary evidence. (Program Assessment)	1 year prior to Site Visit (SV)
Year Six	**Post Analysis** of Year 4/Year 5 Data, Program Strengths and weaknesses based on data analysis and Resulting program modifications (Biennial Report)	Early Fall
	All Institutional Information **posted** for Implementation Review	3 months prior to SV
	Interview Schedule developed to include all constituencies	Draft 2 months prior to SV
	Site Visit/ Implementation Review	Determined by Institution and CTC
	Identification of Exemplary Practices Possibility of a qualitative rubric	During the SV, reviewed by BIR team and COA
	Gather, review and analyze data to inform program **Post Data**	End of Term
Year Seven	Follow up to Site Visit	Determined by COA
	Gather, review and analyze data to inform program **Post Data**	End of Term

In discussing differentiation of activities, the Task Group discussed "triggers" or criteria for determining whether an institution would need greater oversight – such as, for example, a closer review of the institution's candidate assessment and program effectiveness data. Some of the criteria identified by the Task Group include: no annual data reported by the institution, no biennial analysis or discussion of possible program modifications, adverse accreditation decisions in the most recent accreditation visit, or negative survey data that might indicate issues with program quality.

Future Task Group Work
The Accreditation Process Task Group will meet again in May and continue working on the tasks identified above as well as the items listed below. Because the work of this group depends

heavily on the work of the other Task Groups, some decisions and recommendations are dependent upon the other groups completing aspects of their work. Some of these include, but are not limited to, the following:

1) *The use of TPA data in accreditation decisions.* Understanding what kind or what level of data will be available in the future for programs is critical to understanding how accreditation teams might more effectively use these data to inform their decisions about program quality.

2) *Program Assessment Revisions.* The Task Group has agreed to significantly reduce the documentation necessary for program assessment. Suggestions include: clear and direct information about program design and pathway options, limitations on the length of the narrative, a matrix focusing on where competencies (such as TPEs) are introduced, how candidates are provided opportunities to practice, where candidates are provided the opportunity to practice and where these competencies are assessed. Clearly defined and consistently reported program information could greatly streamline, make more efficient, and possibly more effective, the review of programs. However, the Task Group needs to better understand what the TPEs and program standards will require in order to determine the specific requirements for a revised program documentation and review process. This work will continue as draft TPEs and program standards become available from the preliminary standards task group.

3) *Second Tier preparation programs* – Given that induction programs comprise more than half the accreditation workload, the Task Group is eager to have discussions with the Induction Task Group to determine whether there are significant differences in Second Tier programs that would warrant a different kind of review process, or revisions to the current process that would take into account recent changes to Induction in California.

4) The accreditation task group recognizes that although performance outcomes and survey data are more particular to teaching credential programs, there are forty types of Commission-approved educator preparation programs that will be impacted by the streamlining and strengthening of the accreditation processes. The task group needs to continue to discuss how the accreditation system will assure quality in all types of educator preparation.

Outcomes and Survey Data
This Task Group accomplished the following at the March 2015 meeting:
- Completed additional revisions to Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject completer surveys.
- Completed additional revisions to the Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject glossary and streamlined language in the surveys accordingly.
- Reviewed additional resources for work on the Preliminary Education Specialist completer survey.
- Discussed approaches for implementing the employer survey.

- Began reviewing and revising the Clear Credential Teacher completer (general education and special education teachers) survey.

Future Task Group Work
Further work on administrator, employer, and master teacher surveys will be taken up at the May 2015 meeting and the following work is taking place prior to the May meeting:
- Complete the Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject surveys is to be completed and begin coding of the surveys for online input.
- Development of the Preliminary Education Specialist completer survey.
- Development of the Clear Credential Teacher completer survey.

Public Access and Data Dashboards
The Public Access and Data Dashboards (PADD) Task Group met for the second time in March 2015 and focused on two primary goals:

1. Examine the data that is currently collected, reported and publicly available on the Commission's website with the goal of reducing redundancy in data collection and reporting through the development and use of a Data Warehouse.

2. Identify how the development of Data Dashboard Profiles with aggregate data displayed at the state, institution, program, county, and district level could provide more accessibility, transparency and functionality for prospective educators, Commission staff, institutions, programs, stakeholders, researchers, other state agencies, and the general public. The goal would be to establish a comprehensive data presence for the Commission providing easy access to available data and information on educator preparation programs as well as other Commission data.

PADD Task Group members made substantial progress in developing a concept for a Data Warehouse and Data Dashboard Profiles that could be rolled out in three distinct phases. For example, Phase I could focus on populating already validated and published Commission data into a Data Warehouse to be used as a mechanism for creating Data Dashboard Profiles at various aggregate levels (e.g., state, institution/agency, preparation program).

As an initial step, the PADD Task Group provided input on a draft two-page document *Establishing Public Data Access and Display Guidelines and identifying Aggregate Data Elements for Public Display on Dashboard Profiles* (Appendix B). The Task Group then worked through a series of problems and potential solutions in moving forward with this work as outlined below.

A. *Problems*
   All data elements examined by the Task Group are currently published primarily in mandated state and federal reports in a pdf format on the Commission's web site each year. While aggregate state level data is generally provided with five years of data for trend analysis, aggregate data for an institution or other entities is generally only provided for a single report year and each data element is reported in a separate table with a listing of all

institutions. In order to examine all data elements for a single institution across multiple years, an individual would need to access multiple reports (e.g., Teacher Supply Report, Title II Institution Report Card) and many tables within those reports.

Other public data for institutions such as accreditation decisions, final accreditation reports and approved programs by institution are all contained in multiple locations throughout the Commission's website necessitating multiple clicks and pages to access and gather all information available on a single institution. Significant staff time is spent on responding to public records and data requests for legislative staff, researchers, the media, attorneys, and the general public.

B. *Proposed Solutions:*
Emerging consensus within the PADD Task Group identifies the creation of a Data Warehouse populated by all current and future verified data collected and reported by the Commission. This concept is addressed in the Governor's proposed budget for 2015-16 to allow the Commission to pull the data elements together and collect additional data. The Warehouse data may then be aggregated to populate a Statewide Data Dashboard Profile that connects to other Data Dashboards with aggregate data for Commission-accredited institutions, educator preparation programs, counties, and school districts (e.g., assignment monitoring and intern permits and waivers are restricted to the local employing agency).

The Warehouse could also potentially be developed as a future portal for submission of standardized templates of required documentation by Institutions (Approved Program Sponsors) as part of the Accreditation cycle. Institutions and Commission staff could streamline the accreditation process and facilitate communication through password protected dashboards for each Institution. Institution staff would be able to access all prior accreditation documentation, data to inform program improvement, and easily populate an initial password protected dashboard for the accreditation site visit team. This option would also assist those program sponsors that experience staff changes during the accreditation cycle.

With the above goals, problems, and proposed solutions in mind, the PADD Task Group identified numerous factors in development of both the Data Warehouse and Data Dashboard Profiles:

1. The Public Access Data Dashboard should provide a single portal that the public, institutions, and others use to access information about institutions, teacher preparation programs, all credentials, permits and authorizations issued, assignment monitoring at state, county and district level, and educator disciplinary actions.

2. The system should be supported by a single repository of data (i.e., data warehouse) that populates the information and data displayed on each data dashboard (all data would be centrally located and accessible by staff as needed for information and data requests).

3. Distinct profiles should be developed for the state, institution, educator preparation programs, counties, and school districts as indicated in number one above. Each profile would be populated with information that is submitted into the comprehensive Data Warehouse information system.

4. A profile should provide a quick overview of data highlights but the system also needs to have the capability to drill down and get more detailed data both through a drill down function and as a separate link to an index with all available data hyperlinked to spreadsheets allowing for individual report creation with the data.

5. There needs to be an organized input process with standardized templates for accreditation purposes. Technical assistance should be provided to understand the data entry process. Ongoing technical support should be available for questions and problem-solving.

6. There should be public access to all aggregate data elements mandated for reporting by the state or federal government (e.g., Title II Institution Report Card, Teacher Supply Report, and Assignment Monitoring Report). In addition, password protected access should be available for each Commission-accredited institution that submits data so that reports can be generated for the purposes of both Accreditation and data informed decision making for continuous improvement of the programs and unit as a whole.

7. The system should be able to display longitudinal data across a minimum of five years.

8. The Data Warehouse should include both aggregate and disaggregate data. The Data Dashboard Profiles focus on displaying various levels of aggregate data.

9. Aggregate and disaggregated data will be available for download.

10. The system should have categories for the data and support an individual to filter or search for specific data.

11. The system should include a glossary and the ability for definitions to pop-up when hovering over a data term.

12. The system should include recorded video tutorials and written instructions for public use of the dashboards and similar products for those entities that input data and develop program or institution specific reports.

13. Accreditation status data and information should be available on the Data Dashboard Profiles at the state, institution, and program level so multiple institutional websites would not have to be accessed to obtain this data for the prospective educators or the public.

Future Task Group Work
- Specify data elements and how they might best be combined for various Data Dashboard Profile Displays. There will be one main Dashboard and from that there will be several dashboards in which related data elements will be grouped and published. For example, teacher candidate level data (gender, ethnicity, age, undergraduate academic major, credentials issued by subject area, etc.) may be grouped to give a statewide picture of current California teacher candidates.

- Work with staff from the Commission's technology division (ETSS) to finalize the list of data elements for the first phase of the Data Warehouse.
- Create and identify Data Warehouse and Dashboard Profile functionality and use proposals to inform the development of these systems.

Recommended Action

Staff requests that the Commission review and discuss the progress made by each of the six task groups along with the planned future work, and advise staff of any desired modifications or changes in direction. Feedback as to how well the work is aligned with the Commission's objectives and desired outcomes for the accreditation system will continue to direct this work.

1. Postpone the date for submission of Program Assessment documentation for the Yellow cohort institutions from December 2015 to fall 2016.

   Rationale: With the planned modifications to the Program Assessment process and the change to the Program Assessment submission from Year 4 of the accreditation cycle to Year 5, the task group and staff recommend the Commission take action to postpone Program Assessment for the Yellow cohort from December 2015 to fall 2016.

2. Direct staff to begin gathering stakeholder feedback on the Task Group recommendations after the May 2015 Task Group meetings.

   Rationale: With summer 2015 approaching including the summer break for many K-12 schools, colleges, and universities, staff suggest that feedback on Task Group recommendations be collected as soon as possible after the May 2015 Task Group meeting. The usual process would be to present the recommendations at the June 18-19, 2015 Commission meeting and then gather feedback from stakeholders following the meeting. However, by the third week of June most universities and school districts are on summer break and feedback would likely be minimal until the fall term has begun.

Next Steps

Staff will continue to work with the Task Groups as well as the Advisory Panel. The Task Groups and Advisory Panel will meet in May 2015. Another update will be presented at the June 2015 Commission meeting.

Appendix A

Accreditation: Strengthening and Streamlining Task Group Members

First	Last	Employer	Role
Preliminary Program Standards			
Victoria	*Graf*	*Loyola Marymount University*	*Professor*
Sharon	*Russell*	*CSU CalState TEACH*	*Dean/Director*
James	Brescia	San Luis Obispo County Office of Education	County Superintendent
Cynthia	Grutzik	CSU Long Beach	Associate Dean
John	Pascarella	Rossier School of Education USC	Director of Fieldwork, Assistant Professor
Maritza	Rodriguez	University of California, Riverside	Assistant Dean and Director
Nancy	Watkins	Valencia High School	Assistant Principal
Jeanine	Wulfenstein	Temecula Valley Unified School District	Science & STEM Teacher/ Assistant Principal
Induction Policies and Standards			
Jane	*Robb*	*California Teachers Association*	*Instruction and Professional Development*
David	*Simmons*	*Ventura County Office of Education*	*Assistant Superintendent, Personnel Services*
Nikol	Baker	Lake Elementary School District	Superintendent/Principal
Aida	Buelna-Valenzuela	Esparto Unified School District	Superintendent
Conni	Campbell	Point Loma Nazarene University	Professor, Associate Dean
Baljinder	Dhillon	Cascade Union Elementary School District	Superintendent
Barbara	Howard	Riverside County Office of Education	Director II
Karman	Mak	Partnerships to Uplift Communities	Induction Coordinator and Instructional Coach
Jared	Stallones	CSU Long Beach	Program Coordinator
Lisa	Tiwater	Stanislaus County Office of Education	Director II School and District Support
Performance Assessments-Teacher and Administrator			
Amy	*Reising*	*High Tech High*	*Director*
Tine	*Sloan*	*UC Santa Barbara*	*Director*
Deborah	Erickson	Point Loma Nazarene University	Dean, School of Education
Carolyn	Johnson	San Jose State University	University Supervisor
Victoria	Kelly	California Lutheran University	Director, MA in Educational Leadership
Lori	Kim	CSU, Los Angeles	Faculty
Edmundo	Litton	Loyola Marymount University	Professor and Chair
Mary	McNeil	Needles Unified School District	Superintendent
Carolyn	Nelson	CSU East Bay	Dean
Colleen	Torgerson	CSU Fresno	Faculty
Mick	Verdi	CSU San Bernardino	Associate Dean
Accreditation Policies and Procedures			
Cheryl	*Forbes*	*University of California, San Diego*	*Director of Teacher Education*
Margo	*Pensavalle*	*University of Southern California*	*Faculty*
Paul	Beare	CSU Fresno	Dean

First	Last	Employer	Role
Jo	Birdsell	National University	Professor
Jon	McNeil	Whittier City School District	Assistant Superintendent
Nina	Potter	San Diego State University	Director of Assessment
Iris	Riggs	California State University, San Bernardino	Professor
James	Webb	Hart Induction Program	Induction Director
Outcomes/Surveys			
Jon	*Snyder*	*Stanford*	*Executive Director SCOPE*
Susan	Belenardo	La Habra City School District	Superintendent
Rebekah	Harris	Azusa Pacific University	Director, Office of Credentials and Student Placements
Paul	Kang	Chapman University	Research Assistant Professor
Sue	Marshall	UCLA	Associate Director, Extension Dept. of Education
Paul	Tuss	CSU Chancellor's office	Director
Mark	Vigario	Sacramento County Office of Education	Assistant Superintendent
Public Access\Data Dashboards			
Kathleen	*Knutzen*	*CSU Bakersfield*	*Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs*
Carlye	*Olsen*	*Whittier Union High School District*	*Director*
Jessica	Charles	UC Berkeley	Director of Professional Programs
Tanya	Fisher	Santa Clara Unified	Assistant Superintendent, Ed. Services
Diane	Fogarty	Loyola Marymount University	Administrator for Fieldwork
Ira	Lit	Stanford	Program Coordinator

Italics indicate Chairs of the Task Groups

Representing Key Stakeholder Organizations-Accreditation Advisory Panel

First	Last	Organization
Margaret	Arthofer	Association of California School Administrators (ACSA)
Christine	Zeppos	Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (AICCU)
Debra	Watkins	California Alliance of African American Educators (CAAAE)
Jay	Speck	California County Superintendents Educational Services Association (CCSESA)
Janet	Davis	California Federation of Teachers (CFT)
Naomi	Eason	California School Boards Association (CSBA)
Beverly	Young	California State University (CSU)
Chandra	McPeters	California Teachers Association (CTA)
Jody	Priselac	University of California (UC)